

Martingale approach in pricing and hedging European options under regime-switching

Grigori N. Milstein*
Vladimir Spokoiny**



* Ural Federal University Ekaterinburg, Russia
** Weierstrass Institute (WIAS) Berlin, Germany

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>
ISSN 1860-5664

SFB 649, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin



Martingale approach in pricing and hedging European options under regime-switching

G.N. Milstein

Department of Mathematics, Ural Federal University,
Lenin Str. 51, 620083 Ekaterinburg, Russia; email: grig.milst@mail.ru

V. Spokoiny

Weierstrass Institute for Applied Analysis and Stochastics, Mohrenstr. 39,
D-10117 Berlin, Germany; email: spokoiny@wias-berlin.de *

Abstract

The paper focuses on the problem of pricing and hedging a European contingent claim for an incomplete market model, in which evolution of price processes for a saving account and stocks depends on an observable Markov chain. The pricing function is evaluated using the martingale approach. The equivalent martingale measure is introduced in a way that the Markov chain remains the historical one, and the pricing function satisfies the Cauchy problem for a system of linear parabolic equations. It is shown that any European contingent claim is attainable using a generalized self-financing replicating strategy. For such a strategy, apart from the initial endowment, some additional funds are required both step-wise at the jump moments of the Markov chain and continuously between the jump moments. It is proved that the additional funds (the additional investments and consumptions) are present in the proposed strategy in a risk-neutral manner, hence the generalized self-financing strategy is self-financing in mean. A payment for the considered option should consist of two parts: the initial endowment and a fair insurance premium in order to compensate for contributions and consumptions arising in future.

Keywords: incomplete markets, martingale measure, generalized self-financing strategy, attainability, self-financing in mean

JEL-Classification: C58

*Financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the Collaborative Research Center 649 "Economic Risk" is gratefully acknowledged

1 Introduction

Let a financial market consist of a saving account $B(t)$ (riskless asset) and d stocks (risky assets) with price processes $X^i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. The system (B, X) is assumed to satisfy the stochastic differential equations

$$dB = r(X, \mu)Bds, \quad (1.1)$$

$$dX^i = X^i \left[b^i(X, \mu)ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij}(X, \mu)dW^j(s) \right], \quad 0 \leq s \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (1.2)$$

where $W = (W^1, \dots, W^d)^\top$ is a d -dimensional standard Wiener process and μ is a Markov chain with finite state space $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m\}$.

Let $X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s), \mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$, $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T$, be a trajectory of the Markov process (X, μ) (we consider the coefficients of (1.2) to be deterministic), where $\mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$ is the Markov chain starting from μ_k at the moment t and $X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s)$ is the solution of (1.2) starting from x at the moment t with $\mu = \mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$. We consider the problem of pricing and hedging a European claim at a maturity time T , specified by a payoff function f which depends on $X(T)$ and $\mu(T)$ by constructing a generalized self-financing strategy.

The model has a Markovian structure, hence the price of the contingent claim should be associated with a function $u(t, x, \mu_k)$. For evaluating $u(t, x, \mu_k)$, we use the martingale approach. To this end we choose an equivalent probability measure under which the discounted underlying assets are martingales. This martingale measure does not change the probabilistic characteristics of the Markov chain μ which remains a historical one. It turns out that the function $u(t, x, \mu_k)$ (or the collection $u_k(t, x) := u(t, x, \mu_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$) satisfies the Cauchy problem for a system of linear parabolic equations. The system can be solved by the Monte Carlo approach.

Analogously to the classical Black-Scholes case, one can expect that the price of the contingent claim $f(X(T), \mu(T))$ along the trajectory $X(s) = X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s)$, $\mu(s) = \mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$ is connected with a wealth process

$$U(s) = u(s, X(s), \mu(s)).$$

Both X and μ are observable and, consequently, we can construct a trading strategy depending not only on X but also on μ . The system (1.1)–(1.2) has two sources of randomness: the d -dimensional Wiener process W and the Markov chain μ . However only the d -dimensional risky asset X and the saving account B are tradable. Hence the model is incomplete. Besides, in contrast to the classical case, the wealth process $U(s)$ here is discontinuous because of discontinuity of the Markov chain μ (we note that the stock prices $X^i(s)$ remain continuous). The process $U(s)$ is right-continuous with left

limits (RCLL or càdlàg process). The discontinuities of $U(s)$ coincide with the jump times of the Markov chain μ .

Let τ be a jump time of μ from the state μ_l to the state μ_r . Then

$$\begin{aligned} U(\tau-) &= u(\tau, X(\tau), \mu_l) = u_l(\tau, X(\tau)), \\ U(\tau) &= u(\tau, X(\tau), \mu_r) = u_r(\tau, X(\tau)) = U(\tau+). \end{aligned}$$

Let $t < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_\nu < T$, $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$, be all times between t and T where $\mu(s)$ has a jump. Between the jumps, i.e. on the intervals $[t, \tau_1)$, (τ_1, τ_2) , \dots , $(\tau_\nu, T]$, the wealth process $U(s)$ is constructed according to a trading strategy $(\Phi(s), \Psi(s)) = (\Phi(s), \Psi^1(s), \dots, \Psi^d(s))$ depending on $(s, X(s), \mu(s))$:

$$\Phi(s) = \varphi(s, X(s), \mu(s)), \quad \Psi^i(s) = \psi^i(s, X(s), \mu(s)), \quad i = 1, \dots, d,$$

and it has the value

$$U(s) = \Phi(s)B(s) + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi^i(s)X^i(s). \quad (1.3)$$

If the strategy is self-financing then

$$U(s) = \Phi(s)dB(s) + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi^i(s)dX^i(s). \quad (1.4)$$

However, the self-financing strategy which is able to replicate the price $u(s, X(s), \mu(s))$, is impossible (see Subsection 4.1). That is why we construct the wealth process in the form of generalized self-financing strategy, i.e. we admit (1.3) with

$$U(s) = \Phi(s)dB(s) + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi^i(s)dX^i(s) + dD_s - dC_s \quad (1.5)$$

instead of (1.4), allowing some contributions dD_s and consumptions dC_s to the wealth process between the jump times.

Starting from the state (x, μ_k) at the moment t with the initial endowment $u(t, x, \mu_k)$, we construct the process $U(s)$ on the interval $[t, \tau_1)$ according to (1.3) and (1.5). At the moment τ_1 the Markov chain μ switches from μ_k to μ_r and the value of the portfolio changes from $u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu_k)$ to $u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu_r)$. Such change in the wealth of the portfolio requires an additional capital (a contribution to the wealth process) if

$$U(\tau_1) = u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu_r) > u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu_k) = U(\tau_1-)$$

or withdrawal (for instance, for consumption) in the case

$$U(\tau_1) = u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu_r) < u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu_k) = U(\tau_1-).$$

We proceed in the same way on the intervals $(\tau_1, \tau_2), \dots, (\tau_\nu, T]$. Thus, we should take into account the future necessary additional investments (contributions)

$$D_{\tau_i} := \max \{u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu_{r_i}) - u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu_{l_i}), 0\}$$

and consumptions

$$C_{\tau_i} := \max \{u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu_{l_i}) - u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu_{r_i}), 0\},$$

$i = 1, \dots, \nu$.

It is shown that any European contingent claim is attainable due to a generalized self-financing strategy. This property brings the considered model closer to the classical Black-Scholes model. The generalized replicating strategy on the interval $[t, T]$ is determined not only by the initial endowment (which is equal to $u(t, X(t), \mu(t))$) and by means of evolution of underlying assets but also due to contributions dD_s with consumptions dC_s and due to additional funds at the jump moments τ_1, \dots, τ_ν . So, the proposed strategy requires some additional investments and consumptions. However, and this is very remarkable, they appear in a risk-neutral manner. To be more precise, it is proved that the mean of all the discounted additional funds on any interval $[t, \bar{t}]$ is equal to zero. One may say that the constructed here generalized self-financing strategy is self-financing in mean. Let us emphasize that the strategy $(\Phi(s), \Psi(s))$, the additional contributions dD_s and consumptions dC_s , and the additional funds at the jump moments are uniquely defined by the function $u(t, x, \mu)$. A payment for the considered option should consist of two parts: the initial endowment (the initial value of the wealth process) and a fair insurance premium in order to compensate for contributions and consumptions arising in future. We see that both financial and insurance aspects appear together in the considered model. However, here we restrict ourselves to constructing the wealth process and the generalized replicating strategy and to determining the necessary additional funds.

In Section 2, we briefly recall the well-known results concerning the classical Black-Scholes model (see, e.g. [5], [14]) in the required form. In Section 3, we choose a martingale measure fixing the chain μ as a historical one and construct the price $u(t, x, \mu_k)$. Section 4 is devoted to the generalized self-financing strategy and it contains derivation of formulas for $(\Phi(s), \Psi(s))$, dD_s , dC_s , and $U(\tau_i) - U(\tau_i-)$. In Section 5, it is proved that the mean of all the discounted additional funds on any interval $[t, \bar{t}]$ is equal to zero, hence the constructed generalized self-financing strategy is self-financing in mean. Using a Markov chain with single jump on the interval $[t, T]$, the proposed approach can be exploited for modelling defaults which is illustrated in Section 6.

2 Preliminary

Let us remind the problem of pricing and hedging a European claim at a maturity time T , specified by a payoff function f which depends on $X(T)$ in the classical Black-Scholes model:

$$dB = r(X)Bds, \quad (2.1)$$

$$dX^i = X^i \left[b^i(X)ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij}(X)dW^j(s) \right], \quad 0 \leq s \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (2.2)$$

In (2.1)–(2.2), $W = (W^1, \dots, W^d)^\top$ is a d -dimensional standard Wiener process on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . As usual, the P -augmentation of the filtration generated by W is denoted by \mathcal{F}_t^W . We write \mathcal{F}_t for the σ -field \mathcal{F}_t^W . It is assumed that the functions $r(x)$, $x^i b^i(x)$, $x^i \sigma^{ij}(x)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $x \in \mathbf{R}_+^d := \{x : x^1 > 0, \dots, x^d > 0\}$, have bounded derivatives with respect to x up to some order. In addition, we assume that the volatility matrix $\sigma(x) = \{\sigma^{ij}(x)\}$ has full rank for any $x \in \mathbf{R}_+^d$.

We denote $X^{t,x}(s)$, $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T$, the solution of (2.2) starting from x at the moment t and we denote $X(s) := X^{0,x}(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq T$. The price $U(t)$ of the contingent claim $f(X(T))$ is defined as the expectation of the discounted value of claim under the martingale measure \tilde{P} :

$$U(t) = E^{\tilde{P}} [B(t)B^{-1}(T)f(X(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t], \quad (2.3)$$

with $B(s) = B(0)e^{\int_0^s r(X(s'))ds'}$. Here \tilde{P} is an equivalent probability measure under which the discounted stock price processes $\tilde{X}^i(s) := B^{-1}(s)X^i(s)$ are all martingales. It is known that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{P}}{dP} &:= Z(T), \\ Z(s) &:= \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\int_0^s \theta^i dW^i(s') + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^s [\theta^i]^2 ds' \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

with the vector $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^d)^\top$ to be equal to

$$\theta = \sigma^{-1}(b - r\mathbf{1}), \quad \mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top, \quad b = (b^1, \dots, b^d)^\top, \quad \sigma = \{\sigma^{ij}\},$$

where r , b , and σ are calculated at $(s', X(s'))$. Here it is assumed that $Z(s)$ is a martingale. A well known sufficient condition for the martingale property is

$$E \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sum_{i=1}^d [\theta^i]^2 ds \right\} < \infty. \quad (2.5)$$

We have

$$dX^i = X^i \left[rds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad X(0) = x, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$\tilde{W}^j(s) = W^j(s) + \int_0^s \theta^j(s') ds'$$

is a \tilde{P} -Brownian motion due to the Girsanov theorem. Now the formula (2.3) can be written in the form

$$U(t) = E^{(2.6)} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(X(s)) ds} f(X(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad (2.7)$$

where the sign $E^{(2.6)}$ means that the averaging is carried by virtue of the system (2.6) with \tilde{W} being the Brownian motion on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \tilde{P})$ with filtration \mathcal{F}_t .

Due to the Markov property, the price $U(t)$ can be represented in the form

$$U(t) = u(t, X(t)), \quad (2.8)$$

where the function $u(t, x)$ is found according to

$$u(t, x) = E^{(2.6)} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(X^{t,x}(s)) ds} f(X^{t,x}(T)) \right]. \quad (2.9)$$

This yields that the function $u(t, x)$ satisfies the following Cauchy problem for the parabolic partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} + r(x) \sum_{i=1}^d x^i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} - r(x)u = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

$$u(T, x) = f(x), \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$a^{ij}(x) = x^i x^j \sum_{l=1}^d \sigma^{il}(x) \sigma^{jl}(x), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, d.$$

The price $U(t) = u(t, X(t))$ coincides with the portfolio value of a trading strategy $(\Phi(t), \Psi(t)) = (\Phi(t), \Psi^1(t), \dots, \Psi^d(t))$, where Φ and Ψ^i denote the portfolio positions in bond $B(t)$ and stocks $X^i(s)$, respectively. Hence $U(t)$ is given by

$$U(t) = \Phi(t)B(t) + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi^i(t)X^i(t).$$

Self-financing property of the trading strategy implies

$$dU(t) = \Phi(t)dB(t) + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi^i(t)dX^i(t). \quad (2.12)$$

On the other hand,

$$dU(t) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} dt + \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} dX^i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} dX^i dX^j. \quad (2.13)$$

The equations (2.12) and (2.13) imply in view of (2.6) and (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t) &= \varphi(t, X(t)) = \frac{1}{B(t)} \left[u(t, X(t)) - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i}(t, X(t)) \cdot X^i(t) \right], \\ \Psi^i(t) &= \psi^i(t, X(t)) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i}(t, X(t)),\end{aligned}\quad (2.14)$$

with

$$\varphi(t, x) = \frac{1}{B(t)} \left[u(t, x) - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i}(t, x) \cdot x^i \right], \quad \psi^i(t, x) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i}(t, x), \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

3 The pricing function $u(t, x, \mu)$

Let us return to the system (1.1)–(1.2)

$$dB = r(X, \mu)Bds, \quad (3.1)$$

$$dX^i = X^i \left[b^i(X, \mu)ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij}(X, \mu)dW^j(s) \right], \quad 0 \leq s \leq T, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.2)$$

In (3.1)–(3.2), $W = (W^1, \dots, W^d)^\top$ is a d -dimensional standard Wiener process and μ is a Markov chain with finite state space $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m\}$ on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . As usual, the P -augmentation of the filtration generated by W (by μ) is denoted by \mathcal{F}_t^W (by \mathcal{F}_t^μ). We write \mathcal{F}_t for the σ -field $\mathcal{F}_t^W \cup \mathcal{F}_t^\mu$, where \mathcal{F}_t^W and \mathcal{F}_t^μ are supposed to be independent.

Let

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -q_1 & q_{12} & \dots & q_{1m} \\ q_{21} & -q_2 & \dots & q_{2m} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ q_{m1} & q_{m2} & \dots & -q_m \end{bmatrix}$$

be the infinitesimal generator matrix of the chain μ with $q_{kl} \geq 0$, $k \neq l$, and

$$\sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} = q_k. \quad (3.3)$$

It is assumed that the functions $r(x, \mu_k)$, $x^i b^i(x, \mu_k)$, $x^i \sigma^{ij}(x, \mu_k)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, $x \in \mathbf{R}_+^d := \{x : x^1 > 0, \dots, x^d > 0\}$, have bounded derivatives with respect to x up to some order. In addition, we assume that the volatility matrix $\sigma(x, \mu_k) = \{\sigma^{ij}(x, \mu_k)\}$ has full rank for any $0 \leq s \leq T$, $x \in \mathbf{R}_+^d$, and μ_k , $k = 1, \dots, m$.

Let $X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s)$, $\mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$, $0 \leq t \leq s \leq T$, be a trajectory of the Markov process (X, μ) , where $\mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$ is the Markov chain starting from μ_k at the moment t , $X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s)$ is the solution of (3.2) starting from x at the moment t with $\mu = \mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$. We denote

$X(s) := X^{0,X(0),\mu(0)}(s)$, $\mu(s) := \mu^{0,\mu(0)}(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq T$. Consider the problem of pricing and hedging a European claim at a maturity time T , specified by a payoff function f which depends on $X(T)$ and $\mu(T)$. Applying the martingale approach, we introduce the option's price using a natural analogue of the formula (2.3). So, the price of the option appears here in a postulated way. This price as a function of t, x, μ plays the key role in construction of the replicating self-financing in mean strategy.

3.1 The equivalent martingale measure

Similarly to the classical Black-Scholes case, one can expect that the price of the contingent claim $f(X(T), \mu(T))$ along the trajectory $X(s), \mu(s)$, $0 \leq s \leq T$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} U(t) &= E^{\tilde{P}} [B(t)B^{-1}(T)f(X(T), \mu(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t], \\ B(s) &= B(0)e^{\int_0^s r(X(s'), \mu(s'))ds'}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

In (3.4), $\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_t^W \cup \mathcal{F}_t^\mu$, \tilde{P} is an equivalent probability measure under which the discounted stock price processes $\tilde{X}^i(s) := B^{-1}(s)X^i(s)$ are all martingales.

Define the vector $\vartheta = (\vartheta^1, \dots, \vartheta^d)^\top$ by

$$\vartheta = \sigma^{-1}(b - r\mathbf{1}), \quad \mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top, \quad b = (b^1, \dots, b^d)^\top, \quad \sigma = \{\sigma^{ij}\},$$

where r , b , and σ are evaluated at $(X(s'), \mu(s'))$; sometimes we write $\vartheta(s)$ instead of $\vartheta(X(s), \mu(s))$. The symbol ϑ is used to distinguish between Black-Scholes case from Section 2 and the considered regime switching situation; cf. (2.4). Below we assume that ϑ satisfies (2.5).

Let us verify that an equivalent martingale measure \tilde{P} can be defined by

$$\frac{d\tilde{P}}{dP} := Z(T), \quad Z(s) := \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\int_0^s \vartheta^i(s') dW^i(s') + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^s [\vartheta^i(s')]^2 ds' \right) \right\},$$

Indeed, due to the Girsanov theorem the process $\tilde{W}(s) = (\tilde{W}^1(s), \dots, \tilde{W}^d(s))$ with

$$\tilde{W}^j(s) = W^j(s) + \int_0^s \vartheta^j(s') ds', \quad j = 1, \dots, d,$$

is a \mathcal{F}_t -standard Wiener process. This yields

$$dX^i = X^i \left[b^i ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} dW^j(s) \right] = X^i \left[b^i ds - \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} \vartheta^j(s) ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) \right],$$

i.e.,

$$dX^i = X^i \left[r ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) \right], \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.5)$$

It easily follows from (3.5) that the processes $\tilde{X}^i(s) := B^{-1}(s)X^i(s)$ are \tilde{P} -martingales.

3.2 The system of parabolic equations for $u(t, x, \mu_k)$

The equality (3.4) can be written in the form

$$U(t) = E^{(3.5)} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(X(s), \mu(s)) ds} f(X(T), \mu(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right],$$

where the sign $E^{(3.5)}$ means that the averaging is carried out with respect to $\mu^{t, \mu_k}(s)$ and $X^{t, x, \mu_k}(s)$, $t \leq s \leq T$, which is the solution of (3.5). Because the process $(X(t), \mu(t))$ is Markovian, the price $U(t)$ can be represented as a function u of the position (t, x, μ) :

$$U(t) = u(t, X(t), \mu(t)), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \quad (3.6)$$

Due to the Markov property,

$$u_k(t, x) := u(t, x, \mu_k) = E^{(3.5)} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(X^{t, x, \mu_k}(s), \mu^{t, \mu_k}(s)) ds} f(X^{t, x, \mu_k}(T), \mu^{t, \mu_k}(T)) \right]. \quad (3.7)$$

In connection with this formula let us note that the discounted price

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\int_0^t r(X^{0, X(0), \mu(0)}(s), \mu^{0, \mu(0)}(s)) ds} u(t, X^{0, X(0), \mu(0)}(t), \mu^{0, \mu(0)}(t)) \\ &= E^{(3.5)} \left[e^{-\int_0^T r(X^{0, X(0), \mu(0)}(s), \mu^{0, \mu(0)}(s)) ds} f(X^{0, X(0), \mu(0)}(T), \mu^{0, \mu(0)}(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] \end{aligned}$$

is a \tilde{P} -martingale.

The infinitesimal generator A of the Markov process (X, μ) governed by the system (3.5) is given by (see [1, 3, 7, 8, 15])

$$\begin{aligned} Ag(x, \mu_k) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}(x, \mu_k) + \sum_{i=1}^d x^i r(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i}(x, \mu_k) \\ &\quad - q_k g(x, \mu_k) + \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} g(x, \mu_l), \quad k = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

It follows from (3.8) that for sufficiently regular functions $f_k(x) := f(x, \mu_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, (for instance, for functions with bounded derivatives up to some order), the functions (3.7) satisfy the following Cauchy problem for the linear system of parabolic partial differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial s}(s, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial^2 u_k}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}(s, x) + \sum_{i=1}^d x^i r(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^i}(s, x) \\ & - r u_k(s, x) - q_k u_k(s, x) + \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} u_l(s, x) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

$$u_k(T, x) = f(x, \mu_k), \quad k = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.10)$$

We derived the system (3.9) by some heuristic arguments. A rigorous proof based on the formula (3.4) is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let the set of functions $u_k(t, x) = u(t, x, \mu_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, satisfy (3.9)–(3.10). Then $U(t)$ defined by (3.4) is equal to*

$$U(t) = u(t, X(t), \mu(t)),$$

where $X(t) = X^{0, X(0), \mu(0)}(t)$ is the solution of (3.2) starting from $X(0)$ with $\mu(t) = \mu^{0, \mu(0)}(t)$.

Proof. As $Z(s)$ is a P -martingale, (3.4) and the Bayes formula yield

$$\begin{aligned} U(t) &= E^{\tilde{P}} [B(t)B^{-1}(T)f(X(T), \mu(T)) \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \frac{E^P [B(t)B^{-1}(T)f(X(T), \mu(T))Z(T) \mid \mathcal{F}_t]}{E^P [Z(T) \mid \mathcal{F}_t]} \\ &= E^P [f(X(T), \mu(T))Y^{t, X(t), \mu(t), 1}(T) \mid \mathcal{F}_t], \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{t, X(t), \mu(t), 1}(s) &= \exp \left\{ - \int_t^s r(X(s'), \mu(s')) ds' \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{i=1}^d \left(\int_t^s \vartheta^i(s') dW^i(s') + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^s [\vartheta^i(s')]^2 ds' \right) \right\}, \quad t \leq s \leq T. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the system for X (see (3.2)) and Y :

$$dX^i = X^i \left[b^i(X, \mu) ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij}(X, \mu) dW^j(s) \right], \quad X^i(t) = x^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, d. \quad (3.12)$$

$$dY = Y \left[-r(X, \mu) ds - \sum_{i=1}^d \vartheta^i(X, \mu) dW^i(s) \right], \quad Y(t) = y, \quad 0 \leq t \leq s \leq T. \quad (3.13)$$

This system generates the Markov process $(X, Y, \mu) = (X^{t, x, \mu_k}(s), Y^{t, x, \mu_k, y}(s), \mu^{t, \mu_k}(s))$, $t \leq s \leq T$, with the following infinitesimal generator on the functions $g(x, y, \mu)$ of the form $g(x, y, \mu) = g(x, \mu)y$ (i.e., the functions are linear with respect to the scalar y):

$$\begin{aligned} Ag(x, y, \mu_k) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}(x, y, \mu_k) + \sum_{i=1}^d x^i b^i(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i}(x, y, \mu_k) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d x^i \sigma^{ij}(X, \mu_k) y \vartheta^j(X, \mu_k) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^i \partial y}(x, y, \mu_k) - r(X, \mu_k) y \frac{\partial g}{\partial y}(x, y, \mu_k) \\ &\quad - q_k g(x, y, \mu_k) + \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} g(x, y, \mu_l), \quad k = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Substituting $\sigma \vartheta = b - r\mathbf{1}$ and $g(x, y, \mu) = g(x, \mu)y$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &- \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d x^i \sigma^{ij}(X, \mu_k) y \vartheta^j(X, \mu_k) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^i \partial y}(x, y, \mu_k) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^d x^i b^i(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i}(x, y, \mu_k) + \sum_{i=1}^d x^i r(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i}(x, y, \mu_k), \end{aligned}$$

hence (3.14) turns into

$$\begin{aligned} Ag(x, y, \mu_k) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}(x, \mu_k) y + \sum_{i=1}^d x^i r(x, \mu_k) \frac{\partial g}{\partial x^i}(x, \mu_k) y \\ &\quad - r(X, \mu_k) g(x, \mu_k) y - q_k g(x, \mu_k) y + \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} g(x, \mu_l) y, \quad k = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

This easily implies due to the Feynman-Kac formula that a probabilistic representation for the solution of the problem (3.9)–(3.10) is given by

$$u(t, x, \mu_k) = E^P [f(X^{t,x,\mu_k}(T), \mu^{t,\mu_k}(T)) Y^{t,x,\mu_k,1}(T)], \quad (3.16)$$

where $X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s)$, $Y^{t,x,\mu_k,1}(s)$ is the solution of (3.12)–(3.13) with $\mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)$. Comparison of (3.11) and (3.16) completes the proof.

Remark 3.1. It is worth noting that the infinitesimal generator does not depend on the drift b while X and Y do depend on it. The issue here is that a solution of a system of parabolic equations has a lot of different probabilistic representations; see, for instance, [9, 11], where this fact is used for variance reduction when applying the Monte Carlo technique. One possible representation which does not involve the drift b can be given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u_k(t, x) &:= u(t, x, \mu_k) \\ &= E^{(3.18)} \left[e^{-\int_t^T r(X^{t,x,\mu_k}(s), \mu^{t,\mu_k}(s)) ds} f(X^{t,x,\mu_k}(T), \mu^{t,\mu_k}(T)) \right], \\ &\quad k = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

$$dX^i = X^i \left[r(X, \mu) ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij}(X, \mu) dw^j(s) \right], \quad X^i(t) = x^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (3.18)$$

where w is a d -dimensional Wiener process and \mathcal{F}_t^w and \mathcal{F}_t^μ are independent. This representation repeats (3.7), (3.5) (however, \tilde{P} -independence of $\mathcal{F}_t^{\tilde{W}}$ and \mathcal{F}_t^μ is not proved).

Remark 3.2. Because $\mu(s)$ remains constant on any of the intervals $[t, \tau_1)$, $[\tau_1, \tau_2)$, \dots , $[\tau_\nu, T]$, it follows from (3.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}(s, x, \mu(s)) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x, \mu(s)) \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}(s, x, \mu(s)) + \sum_{i=1}^d r(x, \mu(s)) x^i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i}(s, x, \mu(s)) \\ - ru(s, x, \mu(s)) - q_{\mu(s)} u(s, x, \mu(s)) + \sum_{l \neq \mu(s)} q_{\mu(s)l} u(s, x, l) = 0, \\ s \in [t, \tau_1) \cup [\tau_1, \tau_2) \cup \dots \cup [\tau_\nu, T]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

The differentiation here with respect to time s at $t, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_\nu$ is understood as differentiation from the right.

The next section shows that the use of the price function $u(s, x, \mu)$ enables us to construct the replicating wealth process.

Remark 3.3. Suppose that an infinitesimal generator matrix $Q^{(1)}$ is such that $q_{kl}^{(1)} > 0$ if and only if $q_{kl} > 0$. It is known ([13], P. 39) that the new law of the Markov chain is equivalent to the old one. Basing on the new law we can introduce the equivalent martingale measure $\tilde{P}^{(1)}$ instead of the measure \tilde{P} and repeat the previous construction. Clearly, we obtain the new pricing function $u^{(1)}(t, x, \mu_k)$ which satisfies the system (3.9)–(3.10) with $q_{kl}^{(1)}$ instead of q_{kl} . The questions concerning the choice of an equivalent martingale measure are not considered here. However, bearing in mind the problem of evaluating a fair insurance premium, the real world probability measure for μ given by Q seems to be suitable.

4 The wealth process, the generalized self-financing strategy, attainability

Let $t < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_\nu < \bar{t}$, $0 \leq t < \bar{t} \leq T$, be all the times between t and \bar{t} where $\mu(s)$ has a jump. Using the Ito formula for $u(s, X(s), \mu(s))$ on the intervals $[\tau_0, \tau_1)$, (τ_1, τ_2) , \dots , $(\tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1}]$, $\tau_0 := t$, $\tau_{\nu+1} := \bar{t}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} du &= \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} ds + \sum_{i=1}^d r \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i ds + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} ds \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s), \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}, \quad i = 0, \dots, \nu, \quad \nu = 0, 1, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

On an interval $[t, \bar{t}]$, $0 \leq t \leq \bar{t} \leq T$, we get (see [15])

$$\begin{aligned} &u(\bar{t}, X(\bar{t}), \mu(\bar{t})) - u(t, X(t), \mu(t)) \\ &= \int_t^{\bar{t}} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + \sum_{i=1}^d r \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \right) ds + \int_t^{\bar{t}} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu(\tau_i)) - u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu(\tau_i-)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

with the preceding notation the sum $\sum_{i=1}^0 := 0$.

In contrast to the classical case, the process

$$U(s) = u(s, X(s), \mu(s)) \quad (4.3)$$

here is discontinuous on $[t, T]$ because of discontinuity of the Markov chain μ (we note that the asset prices $X^i(s)$ remain continuous). The process $U(s)$ is right-continuous

with left limits (RCLL process), i.e. it is càdlàg. The discontinuity moments of $U(s)$ coincide with the jump times τ_i of the Markov chain μ which are observable.

4.1 Impossibility of a replicating self-financing strategy

Let us suppose for a moment that $U(s)$ is the value of a self-financing portfolio defined by $(\Phi_s, \Psi_s) = (\Phi_s, \Psi_s^1, \dots, \Psi_s^d)$ on the interval (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) , where Φ_s and Ψ_s^i denote the portfolio positions in the bond $B(s)$ and stocks $X^i(s)$, respectively:

$$U(s) = \Phi_s B(s) + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi_s^i X^i(s), \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}. \quad (4.4)$$

The trading strategy (Φ_s, Ψ_s) is self-financing on (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) if

$$\begin{aligned} dU &= \Phi_s dB + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi_s^i dX^i \\ &= \Phi_s r B ds + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi_s^i X^i \left[r ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) \right], \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Suppose that $U(s)$ of the form (4.4) replicates the price u . It follows from (4.3)

$$du = dU, \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}. \quad (4.6)$$

Let $\mu(s) = \mu_k$ under $\tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}$. By comparing (4.1) and (4.5), we conclude

$$\Psi_s^i = \psi^i(s, X(s), \mu(s)) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i}(s, X(s), \mu(s)) = \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^i}(s, X(s)), \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u_k}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \Phi_s r B, \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}. \quad (4.8)$$

Now (4.6), (4.4), and (4.7) imply

$$\Phi_s B(s) = u_k - \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi_s^i X^i(s) = u_k - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^i} X^i(s). \quad (4.9)$$

Substituting this in (4.8) yields

$$\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u_k}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} - r u_k + \sum_{i=1}^d r \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^i} X^i = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

However, (4.10) contradicts to (3.9). Hence the trading strategy of the form (4.4)–(4.5) is impossible and we should allow some contributions dD_s and consumption dC_s to the wealth process.

4.2 The generalized self-financing strategy

We propose to construct the wealth process in the form (4.4) but with the generalized self-financing strategy (see, e.g. [2]):

$$dU = \Phi_s r B ds + \sum_{i=1}^d \Psi_s^i X^i \left[r ds + \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) \right] + dD_s - dC_s, \quad (4.11)$$

$$\mu(s) = \mu_k, \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1},$$

with contributions dD_s and consumptions dC_s . A particular choice is given by

$$dD_s = q_k u_k(s, X(s)) ds, \quad dC_s = \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} u_l(s, X(s)) ds. \quad (4.12)$$

The equality (4.11) is equivalent to

$$B d\Phi_s + \sum_{i=1}^d X^i d\Psi_s^i + \sum_{i=1}^d dX^i d\Psi_s^i = q_k u_k ds - \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} u_l ds, \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}. \quad (4.13)$$

Comparing (4.1) and (4.11) yields

$$\Psi_s^i = \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^i}(s, X(s)), \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}, \quad (4.14)$$

and it follows from (4.3) and (4.14) that

$$\Phi_s = \frac{1}{B(s)} \left[u_k(s, X(s)) - \sum_{i=1}^d X^i(s) \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial x^i}(s, X(s)) \right], \quad \tau_i < s < \tau_{i+1}. \quad (4.15)$$

It is worth noting that the formulas (4.14)–(4.15) coincide with (2.14). However, the strategy (4.14)–(4.15) is not self-financing in contrast to the classical case.

The equations (4.1) and (4.11) replace (4.8) by the formula

$$\frac{\partial u_k}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u_k}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} = \Phi_s r B + q_k u_k ds - \sum_{l \neq k} q_{kl} u_l ds$$

which is consistent with (3.9) if we take into account (4.4). The equality (4.13) for the strategy (4.14)–(4.15) can be checked by direct calculus.

4.3 Dynamics of the wealth replicating process

This section briefly describes the evolution of the wealth process and of the additional funds on the interval $[t, T]$. The initial value $U(t)$ of the wealth process is equal to the initial endowment $u(t, x, \mu(t))$. Due to (4.3), we have

$$U(s) = u(s, X(s), \mu(s)), \quad \mu(s) = \mu(t), \quad t \leq s < \tau_1.$$

Besides, $U(s)$ satisfies (4.3), (4.11) and the funds D_s , C_s are found as (see (4.12)):

$$\begin{aligned} D_s &= \int_t^s q_{\mu(t)} u(s', X(s'), \mu(t)) ds', \\ C_s &= \int_t^s \sum_{l \neq \mu(t)} q_{\mu(t)l} u(s', X(s'), l) ds', \quad t \leq s < \tau_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

So, starting from the initial endowment, the portfolio value $U(s)$ changes on $[t, \tau_1)$ through trading in the saving account B and in the underlying assets X^1, \dots, X^d according to (4.14)–(4.15) and due to the contributions dD_s and consumptions dC_s according to (4.16). Clearly, $U(\tau_1-) = u(\tau_1-, X(\tau_1), \mu(t))$. Let the chain μ jump at the moment τ_1 from the state $\mu(\tau_1-) = \mu(t)$ to the state $\mu(\tau_1)$. Then we set $U(\tau_1) = u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu(\tau_1))$. If the difference

$$U(\tau_1) - U(\tau_1-) = u(\tau_1, X(\tau_1), \mu(\tau_1)) - u(\tau_1-, X(\tau_1), \mu(t))$$

is positive, we need the additional contribution at the moment τ_1 in order to have $U(\tau_1)$ for the wealth process U . And it requires the consumption $U(\tau_1-) - U(\tau_1)$ if the difference $U(\tau_1) - U(\tau_1-)$ is negative. On the intervals $[\tau_1, \tau_2), \dots, [\tau_\nu, T]$ and at the jump moments τ_2, \dots, τ_ν the behavior of the wealth process is similar. In particular, we obtain

$$U(T) = u(T, X^{t,x,\mu(t)}(T), \mu^{t,\mu(t)}(T)) = f(X^{t,x,\mu(t)}(T), \mu^{t,\mu(t)}(T)).$$

This equality shows that any European contingent claim is attainable in the considered model. Such a property is usual for complete markets. However, it is not fulfilled for incomplete markets in the class of self-financing strategies. In our case the considered market is incomplete and the attainability is achieved by using a generalized self-financing strategy.

Remark 4.1. Computational aspects of the considered model can be developed on the base of numerical integration of stochastic differential equations (see [6, 9, 11]) using special methods from computational finance, in particular, Monte Carlo methods [4]. A lot of works are devoted to numerics in finance; see e.g. [10] and [12] among many others.

5 The generalized self-financing strategy is self-financing in mean

Introduce the value at time t of the s -price u :

$$\begin{aligned} v(s, X^{t,x,\mu(t)}(s), \mu^{t,\mu(t)}(s)) \\ := e^{-\int_t^s r(X^{t,x,\mu(t)}(s'), \mu^{t,\mu(t)}(s')) ds'} u(s, X^{t,x,\mu(t)}(s), \mu^{t,\mu(t)}(s)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

The discounted additional funds F_1 during the time from t to T inside the intervals (τ_i, τ_{i+1}) , $i = 0, \dots, \nu$ with $\tau_0 := t$ and $\tau_\nu + 1 := T$, are equal to

$$F_1 = \int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s r ds'} [q_{\mu(s)} u(s, X(s), \mu(s)) - \sum_{l \neq \mu(s)} q_{\mu(s)l} u(s, X(s), l)] ds, \quad (5.2)$$

and the discounted additional funds F_2 at the moments τ_i , $i = 1, \dots, \nu$, are equal to

$$F_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} e^{-\int_t^{\tau_i} r ds'} [u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu(\tau_i)) - u(\tau_i, X(\tau_i), \mu(\tau_i-))]. \quad (5.3)$$

Theorem 5.1. *The \tilde{P} -mean of all the discounted additional funds on the interval $[t, T]$ is equal to zero.*

Proof. Applying the Ito formula to the function v on the interval $[t, T]$ (see [3], [15]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(T, X(T), \mu(T)) - v(t, X(t), \mu(t)) &= e^{-\int_t^T r ds'} u(T, X(T), \mu(T)) - u(t, x, \mu(t)) \quad (5.4) \\ &= \int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s r ds'} \left[-ru + \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} + \sum_{i=1}^d r \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i \right] ds \\ &\quad + \int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s r ds'} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s) + F_2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (3.19), we get from (5.4)

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-\int_t^T r ds'} f(X(T), \mu(T)) - u(t, x, \mu(t)) \\ &= F_1 + F_2 + \int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s r ds'} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} X^i \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma^{ij} d\tilde{W}^j(s). \quad (5.5) \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of price u (see (3.7)) the mean of the left-hand side of (5.5) is equal to zero, hence the \tilde{P} -mean of the right-hand side is equal to $E^{\tilde{P}}(F_1 + F_2) = 0$. Theorem 5.1 is proved.

Corollary 5.1. *By the same way it can be proved that the \tilde{P} -mean of all the discounted additional funds on the any interval $[t, \bar{t}]$, $t < \bar{t} \leq T$, is equal to zero.*

6 A single jump case

As an example, let us consider the situation when there is only a single jump of the Markov chain on the interval $[t, T]$. Such a situation can be modelled by the system (3.1)–(3.2) where the chain μ has absorbing states. For definiteness, consider the chain

with two states μ_1 and μ_2 where μ_2 is the absorbing state. The infinitesimal generator matrix of such chain is equal to

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -q & q \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad q > 0.$$

Let $\tau > t$ be a (single) jump time of the chain $\mu^{t, \mu_1}(s)$. If $\tau > T$ then during the time $t \leq s \leq T$ the chain has no jumps, i.e., $\mu^{t, \mu_1}(s) \equiv \mu_1$, $t \leq s \leq T$. The price $u(t, x, \mu_k)$, $k = 1, 2$, is given by (3.7) where the functions $u_1(t, x)$, $u_2(t, x)$ satisfy the system (see (3.9)–(3.10)):

$$\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_1^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u_1}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} + \sum_{i=1}^d r_1 x^i \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x^i} - r_1 u_1 - q u_1 + q u_2 = 0, \quad (6.1)$$

$$u_1(T, x) = f_1(x),$$

$$\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_2^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 u_2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} + \sum_{i=1}^d r_2 x^i \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x^i} - r_2 u_2 = 0, \quad u_2(T, x) = f_2(x). \quad (6.2)$$

This system can be solved sequentially starting from the second equation. We also note that in this case, the generalized self-financing strategy on the interval $[\tau, T]$ reduces to self-financing one.

If $u_2(\tau, x) \gg u_1(\tau, x)$ then there is a possibility of default. Consider the particular case when $r_1 = r_2 := r$, $a_1^{ij} = a_2^{ij} := a^{ij}$, but

$$f_2(x) \geq f_1(x). \quad (6.3)$$

Subtracting (6.1) from (6.2), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial(u_2 - u_1)}{\partial s} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2(u_2 - u_1)}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} + \sum_{i=1}^d r x^i \frac{\partial(u_2 - u_1)}{\partial x^i} \quad (6.4)$$

$$-r(u_2 - u_1) - q(u_2 - u_1) = 0, \quad u_2 - u_1 = f_2 - f_1 \geq 0.$$

It follows from (6.3) and (6.4) that

$$u_2(s, x) - u_1(s, x) \geq 0, \quad t \leq s \leq T. \quad (6.5)$$

Therefore

$$F_1 = \int_t^{\tau \wedge T} e^{-\int_t^s r ds'} q[u_1(s, X(s)) - u_2(s, X(s))] ds \leq 0.$$

Because the integrand here is negative, the value $-e^{-\int_t^s r ds'} q[u_1(s, X(s)) - u_2(s, X(s))] ds$ is positive. This value is the discounted consumption on $[s, s + ds]$ and therefore $-F_1$ is

the summarized discounted consumption of the wealth process on the interval $[t, \tau \wedge T]$. Further,

$$F_2 = \begin{cases} e^{-\int_t^\tau r ds'} [u_2(\tau, X(\tau)) - u_1(\tau, X(\tau))], & t < \tau \leq T, \\ 0, & \tau > T, \end{cases}$$

is positive, hence F_2 is the necessary additional contribution to the wealth process. According to Theorem 5.1 $E^{\tilde{P}} F_2 = -E^{\tilde{P}} F_1$. In the case of default, $E^{\tilde{P}} F_2 \gg 0$ and therefore the \tilde{P} -mean of the discounted consumption is large as well. This can be done only at cost of the sufficiently large endowment. This fact corresponds with our intuition: in the prevision of a serious default the price of the option should be large.

7 Summary and outlook

The paper considers the problem of pricing and hedging a European-type contingent claim in an incomplete market with regime switching. First we show that a replicating self-financing strategies in this situation does not exist. Instead, for any contingent claim, we construct a generalized self-financing strategy. Such a strategy requires not only an initial endowment but also some additional funds (additional investments and consumptions) which have to be involved both at the jump moments of the Markov chain and continuously between the jump moments. However, these additional funds are risk-neutral, so that the generalized self-financing strategy is self-financing in mean.

The construction is based on the general martingale approach and it is reduced to a system of linear parabolic differential equations which can be solved numerically by a Monte Carlo method.

A payment for the considered option should consist of two parts: the initial endowment and a fair insurance premium in order to compensate for contributions and consumptions arising in future. So, both financial and insurance aspects appear together in the considered model. This paper restricts itself to constructing the generalized replicating strategy and to determining the necessary additional funds. The insurance premium aspect will be studied elsewhere.

References

- [1] Dynkin E.B. Markov Processes. Springer, 1965.
- [2] Elliott R.J., Kopp P.E. Mathematics of Financial Markets. Springer, 1999.
- [3] Gichman I.I., Skorochod A.V. Stochastic Differential Equations and their Applications. Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1982.

- [4] Glasserman P. Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering. Springer, 2003.
- [5] Karatzas I., Shreve S.E. Methods of Mathematical Finance. Springer, 1998.
- [6] Kloeden P.E., Platen E. Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations. Springer, 1992.
- [7] Milstein G.N. Interaction of Markov processes. Theory Prob. Appl., **17**(1972), 36-45.
- [8] Milstein G.N. On a probabilistic solution of linear systems of elliptic and parabolic equations. Theory Prob. Appl., **23**(1978), 851-855.
- [9] Milstein G.N. Numerical Integration of Stochastic Differential Equations. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995 (English translation from Russian 1988).
- [10] Milstein G.N., Schoenmakers J.G.M. Numerical construction of hedging strategies against multi-asset European claims. Stochastics and Stochastics Reports, **73**(2002), no. 1-2, 125-157.
- [11] Milstein G.N., Tretyakov M.V. Stochastic Numerics for Mathematical Physics. Springer, 2004.
- [12] Milstein G.N., Tretyakov M.V. Numerical analysis of Monte Carlo evaluation of Greeks by finite differences. J. of Computational Finance, **8**(2005), no. 3, 1-33.
- [13] Rogers L.C.G., Williams D. Diffusions, Markov Processes, and Martingales, v. 2, Ito Calculus. John Wiley & Sons, 1987.
- [14] Shiryaev A.N. Essentials of Stochastic Finance: Facts, Models, Theory. World Scientific, 1999.
- [15] Skorochod A.V. Asymptotic Methods of the Theory of Stochastic Differential Equations. Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1987.

SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2011

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>.

- 001 "Localising temperature risk" by Wolfgang Karl Härdle, Brenda López Cabrera, Ostap Okhrin and Weining Wang, January 2011.
- 002 "A Confidence Corridor for Sparse Longitudinal Data Curves" by Shuzhuan Zheng, Lijian Yang and Wolfgang Karl Härdle, January 2011.
- 003 "Mean Volatility Regressions" by Lu Lin, Feng Li, Lixing Zhu and Wolfgang Karl Härdle, January 2011.
- 004 "A Confidence Corridor for Expectile Functions" by Esra Akdeniz Duran, Mengmeng Guo and Wolfgang Karl Härdle, January 2011.
- 005 "Local Quantile Regression" by Wolfgang Karl Härdle, Vladimir Spokoiny and Weining Wang, January 2011.
- 006 "Sticky Information and Determinacy" by Alexander Meyer-Gohde, January 2011.
- 007 "Mean-Variance Cointegration and the Expectations Hypothesis" by Till Strohsal and Enzo Weber, February 2011.
- 008 "Monetary Policy, Trend Inflation and Inflation Persistence" by Fang Yao, February 2011.
- 009 "Exclusion in the All-Pay Auction: An Experimental Investigation" by Dietmar Fehr and Julia Schmid, February 2011.
- 010 "Unwillingness to Pay for Privacy: A Field Experiment" by Alastair R. Beresford, Dorothea Kübler and Sören Preibusch, February 2011.
- 011 "Human Capital Formation on Skill-Specific Labor Markets" by Runli Xie, February 2011.
- 012 "A strategic mediator who is biased into the same direction as the expert can improve information transmission" by Lydia Mechtenberg and Johannes Münster, March 2011.
- 013 "Spatial Risk Premium on Weather Derivatives and Hedging Weather Exposure in Electricity" by Wolfgang Karl Härdle and Maria Osipenko, March 2011.
- 014 "Difference based Ridge and Liu type Estimators in Semiparametric Regression Models" by Esra Akdeniz Duran, Wolfgang Karl Härdle and Maria Osipenko, March 2011.
- 015 "Short-Term Herding of Institutional Traders: New Evidence from the German Stock Market" by Stephanie Kremer and Dieter Nautz, March 2011.
- 016 "Oracally Efficient Two-Step Estimation of Generalized Additive Model" by Rong Liu, Lijian Yang and Wolfgang Karl Härdle, March 2011.
- 017 "The Law of Attraction: Bilateral Search and Horizontal Heterogeneity" by Dirk Hofmann and Salmai Qari, March 2011.
- 018 "Can crop yield risk be globally diversified?" by Xiaoliang Liu, Wei Xu and Martin Odening, March 2011.
- 019 "What Drives the Relationship Between Inflation and Price Dispersion? Market Power vs. Price Rigidity" by Sascha Becker, March 2011.
- 020 "How Computational Statistics Became the Backbone of Modern Data Science" by James E. Gentle, Wolfgang Härdle and Yuichi Mori, May 2011.
- 021 "Customer Reactions in Out-of-Stock Situations – Do promotion-induced phantom positions alleviate the similarity substitution hypothesis?" by Jana Luisa Diels and Nicole Wiebach, May 2011.

SFB 649, Spandauer Str. 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".




SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2011

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>.

- 022 "Extreme value models in a conditional duration intensity framework" by Rodrigo Herrera and Bernhard Schipp, May 2011.
- 023 "Forecasting Corporate Distress in the Asian and Pacific Region" by Russ Moro, Wolfgang Härdle, Saeideh Aliakbari and Linda Hoffmann, May 2011.
- 024 "Identifying the Effect of Temporal Work Flexibility on Parental Time with Children" by Juliane Scheffel, May 2011.
- 025 "How do Unusual Working Schedules Affect Social Life?" by Juliane Scheffel, May 2011.
- 026 "Compensation of Unusual Working Schedules" by Juliane Scheffel, May 2011.
- 027 "Estimation of the characteristics of a Lévy process observed at arbitrary frequency" by Johanna Kappus and Markus Reiß, May 2011.
- 028 "Asymptotic equivalence and sufficiency for volatility estimation under microstructure noise" by Markus Reiß, May 2011.
- 029 "Pointwise adaptive estimation for quantile regression" by Markus Reiß, Yves Rozenholc and Charles A. Cuenod, May 2011.
- 030 "Developing web-based tools for the teaching of statistics: Our Wikis and the German Wikipedia" by Sigbert Klinke, May 2011.
- 031 "What Explains the German Labor Market Miracle in the Great Recession?" by Michael C. Burda and Jennifer Hunt, June 2011.
- 032 "The information content of central bank interest rate projections: Evidence from New Zealand" by Gunda-Alexandra Detmers and Dieter Nautz, June 2011.
- 033 "Asymptotics of Asynchronicity" by Markus Bibinger, June 2011.
- 034 "An estimator for the quadratic covariation of asynchronously observed Itô processes with noise: Asymptotic distribution theory" by Markus Bibinger, June 2011.
- 035 "The economics of TARGET2 balances" by Ulrich Bindseil and Philipp Johann König, June 2011.
- 036 "An Indicator for National Systems of Innovation - Methodology and Application to 17 Industrialized Countries" by Heike Belitz, Marius Clemens, Christian von Hirschhausen, Jens Schmidt-Ehmcke, Axel Werwatz and Petra Zloczynski, June 2011.
- 037 "Neurobiology of value integration: When value impacts valuation" by Soyoung Q. Park, Thorsten Kahnt, Jörg Rieskamp and Hauke R. Heekeren, June 2011.
- 038 "The Neural Basis of Following Advice" by Guido Biele, Jörg Rieskamp, Lea K. Krugel and Hauke R. Heekeren, June 2011.
- 039 "The Persistence of "Bad" Precedents and the Need for Communication: A Coordination Experiment" by Dietmar Fehr, June 2011.
- 040 "News-driven Business Cycles in SVARs" by Patrick Bunk, July 2011.
- 041 "The Basel III framework for liquidity standards and monetary policy implementation" by Ulrich Bindseil and Jeroen Lamoot, July 2011.
- 042 "Pollution permits, Strategic Trading and Dynamic Technology Adoption" by Santiago Moreno-Bromberg and Luca Taschini, July 2011.
- 043 "CRRA Utility Maximization under Risk Constraints" by Santiago Moreno-Bromberg, Traian A. Pirvu and Anthony Réveillac, July 2011.

SFB 649, Spandauer Str. 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".




SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2011

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>.

- 044 "Predicting Bid-Ask Spreads Using Long Memory Autoregressive Conditional Poisson Models" by Axel Groß-Klußmann and Nikolaus Hautsch, July 2011.
- 045 "Bayesian Networks and Sex-related Homicides" by Stephan Stahlschmidt, Helmut Tausendteufel and Wolfgang K. Härdle, July 2011.
- 046 "The Regulation of Interdependent Markets", by Raffaele Fiocco and Carlo Scarpa, July 2011.
- 047 "Bargaining and Collusion in a Regulatory Model", by Raffaele Fiocco and Mario Gilli, July 2011.
- 048 "Large Vector Auto Regressions", by Song Song and Peter J. Bickel, August 2011.
- 049 "Monetary Policy, Determinacy, and the Natural Rate Hypothesis", by Alexander Meyer-Gohde, August 2011.
- 050 "The impact of context and promotion on consumer responses and preferences in out-of-stock situations", by Nicole Wiebach and Jana L. Diels, August 2011.
- 051 "A Network Model of Financial System Resilience", by Kartik Anand, Prasanna Gai, Sujit Kapadia, Simon Brennan and Matthew Willison, August 2011.
- 052 "Rollover risk, network structure and systemic financial crises", by Kartik Anand, Prasanna Gai and Matteo Marsili, August 2011.
- 053 "When to Cross the Spread: Curve Following with Singular Control" by Felix Naujokat and Ulrich Horst, August 2011.
- 054 "TVICA - Time Varying Independent Component Analysis and Its Application to Financial Data" by Ray-Bing Chen, Ying Chen and Wolfgang K. Härdle, August 2011.
- 055 "Pricing Chinese rain: a multi-site multi-period equilibrium pricing model for rainfall derivatives" by Wolfgang K. Härdle and Maria Osipenko, August 2011.
- 056 "Limit Order Flow, Market Impact and Optimal Order Sizes: Evidence from NASDAQ TotalView-ITCH Data" by Nikolaus Hautsch and Ruihong Huang, August 2011.
- 057 "Optimal Display of Iceberg Orders" by Gökhan Cebiroğlu and Ulrich Horst, August 2011.
- 058 "Optimal liquidation in dark pools" by Peter Kratz and Torsten Schöneborn, September 2011.
- 059 "The Merit of High-Frequency Data in Portfolio Allocation" by Nikolaus Hautsch, Lada M. Kyj and Peter Malec, September 2011.
- 060 "On the Continuation of the Great Moderation: New evidence from G7 Countries" by Wenjuan Chen, September 2011.
- 061 "Forward-backward systems for expected utility maximization" by Ulrich Horst, Ying Hu, Peter Imkeller, Anthony Réveillac and Jianing Zhang.
- 062 "On heterogeneous latent class models with applications to the analysis of rating scores" by Aurélie Bertrand and Christian M. Hafner, October 2011.
- 063 "Multivariate Volatility Modeling of Electricity Futures" by Luc Bauwens, Christian Hafner and Diane Pierret, October 2011.

SFB 649, Spandauer Str. 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".



SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2011

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>.

- 064 "Semiparametric Estimation with Generated Covariates" by Enno Mammen, Christoph Rothe and Melanie Schienle, October 2011.
- 065 "Linking corporate reputation and shareholder value using the publication of reputation rankings" by Sven Tischer and Lutz Hildebrandt, October 2011.
- 066 "Monitoring, Information Technology and the Labor Share" by Dorothee Schneider, October 2011.
- 067 "Minimal Supersolutions of BSDEs with Lower Semicontinuous Generators" by Gregor Heyne, Michael Kupper and Christoph Mainberger, October 2011.
- 068 "Bargaining, Openness, and the Labor Share" by Dorothee Schneider, October 2011.
- 069 "The Labor Share: A Review of Theory and Evidence" by Dorothee Schneider, October 2011.
- 070 "The Power of Sunspots: An Experimental Analysis" by Dietmar Fehr, Frank Heinemann and Aniol Llorente-Saguer, October 2011.
- 071 "Econometric analysis of volatile art markets" by Fabian Y. R. P. Bocart and Christian M. Hafner, October 2011.
- 072 "Financial Network Systemic Risk Contributions" by Nikolaus Hautsch, Julia Schaumburg and Melanie Schienle, October 2011.
- 073 "Calibration of self-decomposable Lévy models" by Mathias Trabs, November 2011.
- 074 "Time-Varying Occupational Contents: An Additional Link between Occupational Task Profiles and Individual Wages" by Alexandra Fedorets, November 2011.
- 075 "Changes in Occupational Demand Structure and their Impact on Individual Wages" by Alexandra Fedorets, November 2011.
- 076 "Nonparametric Nonstationary Regression with Many Covariates" by Melanie Schienle, November 2011.
- 077 "Increasing Weather Risk: Fact or Fiction?" by Weining Wang, Ihtiyor Bobojonov, Wolfgang Karl Härdle and Martin Odening, November 2011.
- 078 "Spatially Adaptive Density Estimation by Localised Haar Projections" by Florian Gach, Richard Nickl and Vladimir Spokoiny, November 2011.
- 079 "Martingale approach in pricing and hedging European options under regime-switching" by Grigori N. Milstein and Vladimir Spokoiny, November 2011.

SFB 649, Spandauer Str. 1, D-10178 Berlin
<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

This research was supported by the Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

